REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed September 14, 2007. Claims 1-29 remain pending in the present application. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and pending claims are respectfully requested.

Response to Rejections of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Nakajima* (U.S. Patent No. 6,701,011).

a.   **Claim 1**

As provided in independent claim 1, Applicants claim:

> A method, comprising:
> receiving a document for printing in an image forming device, wherein a print mode setting is associated with the document; and
> ***printing at least a portion of the document monochromatically or in color based upon the print mode setting and a state of a print mode actuator in the image forming device.***

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that *Nakajima* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "printing at least a portion of the document monochromatically or in color based upon the print mode setting and a state of a print mode actuator in the image forming device," as emphasized above.

For example, *Nakajima* describes an image processing apparatus 1 that produces output data for a printer device 3 or display device 4. *Nakajima* discloses that the "image processing-apparatus preferably determines whether the printer device is a color or monochrome machine and whether the printer device is in a color mode or monochrome mode, and performs image processing using the value/contrast parameters only out of the two types of parameters when the printer device is a monochrome machine or when the printer device is in a monochrome mode." *See* col. 21, lines 52-59. Further, Figs. 16A-16B show an exemplary graphical interface that may be used to set the color/monochrome mode for the printer. Fig. 19 also shows that color processing mode selector 15B is a component of the image processing apparatus 1. It is also noted that printer device 3 is external

to the image processing apparatus 1 and color processing mode selector 15B. As such, *Nakajima* fails to teach or suggest at least "printing at least a portion of the document monochromatically or in color based upon the print mode setting and a state of a print mode actuator in the image forming device," as recited in claim 1. For example, the printer device 3 in *Nakajima* is not disclosed to contain a print mode actuator. Also, the color processing mode selector of *Nakajima* seems to describe a print mode setting and not a print mode actuator, as described in the claim. Accordingly, *Nakajima* does not disclose the operation of printing at least a portion of the document monochromatically or in color based upon (a) the print mode setting and (b) a state of a print mode actuator in the image forming device, as described in claim 1.

As a result, claim 1 is patentable over *Nakajima*, and the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

b. Claims 2-8

Claim 1 is allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons given above. Since claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and recite additional features, claims 2-8 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

c. Claim 9

As provided in independent claim 9, Applicants claim:

> A program embodied in a computer readable medium, comprising:
> code that identifies a print mode setting associated with a document received for printing in an image forming device; and
> **code that implements a printing of at least a portion of the document monochromatically or in color based upon the print mode setting and a state of a print mode actuator in the image forming device.**

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 9 is allowable for at least the reason that *Nakajima* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "code that implements a printing of at least a portion of the document monochromatically or in color based upon the print mode setting and a state of a print mode actuator in the image forming device," as emphasized above.

For example, *Nakajima* describes an image processing apparatus 1 that produces output data for a printer device 3 or display device 4. *Nakajima* discloses that the "image processing-apparatus preferably determines whether the printer device is a color or monochrome machine and whether the printer device is in a color mode or monochrome mode, and performs image processing using the value/contrast parameters only out of the two types of parameters when the printer device is a monochrome machine or when the printer device is in a monochrome mode." *See* col. 21, lines 52-59. Further, Figs. 16A-16B show an exemplary graphical interface that may be used to set the color/monochrome mode for the printer. Fig. 19 also shows that color processing mode selector 15B is a component of the image processing apparatus 1. It is also noted that printer device 3 is external to the image processing apparatus 1 and color processing mode selector 15B. As such, *Nakajima* fails to teach or suggest at least "code that implements a printing of at least a portion of the document monochromatically or in color based upon the print mode setting and a state of a print mode actuator in the image forming device," as recited in claim 9. For example, the printer device 3 in *Nakajima* is not disclosed to contain a print mode actuator. Also, the color processing mode selector of *Nakajima* seems to describe a print mode setting and not a print mode actuator, as described in the claim. Accordingly, *Nakajima* does not disclose the operation of printing at least a portion of the document monochromatically or in color based upon (a) the print mode setting and (b) a state of a print mode actuator in the image forming device, as described in claim 9.

As a result, claim 9 is patentable over *Nakajima*, and the rejection of claim 9 should be withdrawn.

d.   **Claims 10-15**

Claim 9 is allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons given above. Since claims 10-15 depend from claim 9 and recite additional features, claims 10-15 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

e. **Claim 16**

As provided in independent claim 16, Applicants claim:

> An image forming device, comprising:
> a print mode actuator disposed on the image forming device having a first state and a second state; and
> ***a print engine configured to implement a printing of at least a portion of a document monochromatically or in color based upon a print mode setting associated with the document and based upon a state of the print mode actuator in the image forming.***

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 16 is allowable for at least the reason that *Nakajima* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "a print engine configured to implement a printing of at least a portion of a document monochromatically or in color based upon a print mode setting associated with the document and based upon a state of the print mode actuator in the image forming," as emphasized above.

For example, *Nakajima* describes an image processing apparatus 1 that produces output data for a printer device 3 or display device 4. *Nakajima* discloses that the "image processing-apparatus preferably determines whether the printer device is a color or monochrome machine and whether the printer device is in a color mode or monochrome mode, and performs image processing using the value/contrast parameters only out of the two types of parameters when the printer device is a monochrome machine or when the printer device is in a monochrome mode." *See* col. 21, lines 52-59. Further, Figs. 16A-16B show an exemplary graphical interface that may be used to set the color/monochrome mode for the printer. Fig. 19 also shows that color processing mode selector 15B is a component of the image processing apparatus 1. It is also noted that printer device 3 is external to the image processing apparatus 1 and color processing mode selector 15B. As such, *Nakajima* fails to teach or suggest at least "a print engine configured to implement a printing of at least a portion of a document monochromatically or in color based upon a print mode setting associated with the document and based upon a state of the print mode actuator in the image forming," as recited in claim 16. For example, the printer device 3 in *Nakajima* is not disclosed to contain a print mode actuator. Also, the color processing mode selector of *Nakajima* seems to

describe a print mode setting and not a print mode actuator, as described in the claim. Accordingly, *Nakajima* does not disclose the operation of printing at least a portion of the document monochromatically or in color based upon (a) the print mode setting and (b) a state of a print mode actuator in the image forming device," as described in claim 16.

As a result, claim 16 is patentable over *Nakajima*, and the rejection of claim 16 should be withdrawn.

f.   Claims 17-23

Claim 16 is allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons given above. Since claims 17-23 depend from claim 16 and recite additional features, claims 17-23 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

g.   Claim 24

As provided in independent claim 24, Applicants claim:

> An image forming device, comprising:
> means for identifying a print mode setting associated with a document received for printing in an image forming device; and
> **means for implementing a printing of at least a portion of a document monochromatically or in color based upon the print mode setting and a state of a print mode actuator in the image forming device.**

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 24 is allowable for at least the reason that *Nakajima* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "means for implementing a printing of at least a portion of a document monochromatically or in color based upon the print mode setting and a state of a print mode actuator in the image forming device," as emphasized above.

For example, *Nakajima* describes an image processing apparatus 1 that produces output data for a printer device 3 or display device 4. *Nakajima* discloses that the "image processing-apparatus preferably determines whether the printer device is a color or monochrome machine and whether the printer device is in a color mode or monochrome mode, and performs image processing using the value/contrast parameters only out of the two types of parameters when the printer device is a monochrome machine or when the printer device is in a monochrome

13

mode." *See* col. 21, lines 52-59. Further, Figs. 16A-16B show an exemplary graphical interface that may be used to set the color/monochrome mode for the printer. Fig. 19 also shows that color processing mode selector 15B is a component of the image processing apparatus 1. It is also noted that printer device 3 is external to the image processing apparatus 1 and color processing mode selector 15B. As such, *Nakajima* fails to teach or suggest at least "means for implementing a printing of at least a portion of a document monochromatically or in color based upon the print mode setting and a state of a print mode actuator in the image forming device," as recited in claim 24. For example, the printer device 3 in *Nakajima* is not disclosed to contain a print mode actuator. Also, the color processing mode selector of *Nakajima* seems to describe a print mode setting and not a print mode actuator, as described in the claim. Accordingly, *Nakajima* does not disclose the operation of printing at least a portion of the document monochromatically or in color based upon (a) the print mode setting and (b) a state of a print mode actuator in the image forming device, as described in claim 24.

As a result, claim 24 is patentable over *Nakajima*, and the rejection of claim 24 should be withdrawn.

h.   Claims 25-26

Claim 24 is allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons given above. Since claims 25-26 depend from claim 24 and recite additional features, claims 25-25 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

i.   Claim 27

As provided in independent claim 27, Applicants claim:

> A method, comprising:
> determining a state of a print mode actuator, the print mode actuator having at least an application state and a black override state; and
> ***executing a color raster image processing of a document if the print mode actuator is in the application state and the document includes a color print setting.***

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 27 is allowable for at least the reason that *Nakajima* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least

"executing a color raster image processing of a document if the print mode actuator is in the application state and the document includes a color print setting," as emphasized above.

For example, *Nakajima* describes an image processing apparatus 1 that produces output data for a printer device 3 or display device 4. *Nakajima* discloses that the "image processing-apparatus preferably determines whether the printer device is a color or monochrome machine and whether the printer device is in a color mode or monochrome mode, and performs image processing using the value/contrast parameters only out of the two types of parameters when the printer device is a monochrome machine or when the printer device is in a monochrome mode." *See* col. 21, lines 52-59. Further, Figs. 16A-16B show an exemplary graphical interface that may be used to set the color/monochrome mode for the printer. Fig. 19 also shows that color processing mode selector 15B is a component of the image processing apparatus 1. It is also noted that printer device 3 is external to the image processing apparatus 1 and color processing mode selector 15B. As such, *Nakajima* fails to teach or suggest at least "executing a color raster image processing of a document if the print mode actuator is in the application state and the document includes a color print setting," as recited in claim 27. For example, the printer device 3 in *Nakajima* is not disclosed to contain a print mode actuator. Also, the color processing mode selector of *Nakajima* seems to describe a print mode setting and not a print mode actuator, as described in the claim. Accordingly, *Nakajima* does not disclose the operation of printing at least a portion of the document monochromatically or in color based upon (a) the print mode setting and (b) a state of a print mode actuator in the image forming device, as described in claim 27.

As a result, claim 27 is patentable over *Nakajima*, and the rejection of claim 27 should be withdrawn.

j. Claim 28

Claim 27 is allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons given above. Since claim 28 depends from claim 27 and recites additional features, claim 28 is allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles W. Griggers, Reg. No. 47,283